DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 321 655 HE 023 673

AUTHOR Toenjes, Richard H.
TITLE The UNC Charlotte Code of Student Academic Integrity.
INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.; North Carolina Univ., Charlotte.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 35p.; This report is one of a group gathered by the AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project, funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in collaboration with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. For related documents, see HE 023 654-677.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Standards; *Codes of Ethics; *College Students; *Discipline Policy; *Due Process; Guides; Higher Education; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; State Universities; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *AASCU ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project; *University of North Carolina Charlotte

ABSTRACT

The University of North Carolina at Charlotte has developed a Code of Student Academic Integrity as a solution for problems of academic dishonesty in large, young, public, urban universities where traditional honor codes will not work. The Code defines violations and gives typical examples. It provides a friendly settlement procedure in which a faculty member resolves a case of dishonesty directly with the student. A "first offenders" file is designed to deter repeat violations. A faculty-student Academic Integrity Board (AIB) deals with particularly serious first offenses and all second offenses. The AIB is empowered to expel guilty students. A faculty-approved statement of "Deciding Guilt and Punishment" is provided to guide faculty members handling cases directly using the settlement procedure. Results of a study of the impact of the Code show an increase in convictions of academic dishonesty, with most cases being handled by faculty directly. Faculty using the Code in dealing with cheating report that it provides clear guidance. Students who study the Code think highly of it. Efforts to keep the Integrity Code before the minds of the faculty and students are continuing. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED321655

The UNC Charlotte

Code of Student Academic Integrity

+

A Code That Works Where an Honor Code Will Not

+

Report Prepared By:

Richard H. Toenjes
Department of Philosophy
UNC Charlotte
Charlotte, NC 28223
(704) 547-2161

HE023623

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard H. Toenjes
Univ of N.C., Charlotte
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project

The AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory is a two-year project seeking to establish and test a model system for collecting and disseminating information on model programs at AASCU-member institutions--375 of the public four-year colleges and universities in the United States.

The four objectives of the project are:

- To increase the information on model programs available to all institutions through the ERIC system
- To encourage the use of the ERIC system by AASCU institutions
- To improve AASCU's ability to know about, and share information on, activities at member institutions, and
- To test a model for collaboration with ERIC that other national organizations might adopt.

The AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project is funded with a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, in collaboration with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education at The George Washington University.

Abstract

The UNC Charlotte Code of Student Academic Integrity is described. It is a solution for problems of academic dishonesty in large, young, public urban universities where traditional Codes of Honor will not work. The Code states definitions of violations and gives typical examples. It provides a "user friendly" settlement procedure in which a faculty member resolves a case of dishonesty directly with the student. A "first offenders" file is designed to deter repeat violations. A faculty-student Academic Integrity Board (AIB) deals with particularly serious first offenses and all second offenses. The AIB is empowered to expel guilty students. A faculty approved statement on Deciding Guilt and Punishment is provided to guide faculty members handling cases directly using the settlement procedure. And the results of a study of the impact of the Code are summarized. Faculty members who have used the Code in dealing with cheating report that the Code provides clear guidance. Students who study the Code think highly of it. Efforts to keep the Integrity Code before the minds of faculty and students are continuing.

Introduction

Standards of academic integrity, like standards of academic quality, must be defined clearly for students. And it is the faculty's responsibility to insure students meet academic standards, including those of integrity. UNC Charlotte has implemented a Code of Student Academic Integrity, and has operated under this Code for five years, since 1984. The Code provides clear definitions and typical examples of behavior that violates standards of integrity. It provides a simple and fair procedure for faculty members to follow in dealing with suspected violations. In particular, it provides for a "user friendly" process in which a faculty member can resolve a case of dishonesty directly with the student, using a one-page settlement form. The Code also makes explicit the ethical principles that provide the grounds for the regulations.

This report describes and explains The UNC Charlotte Code of Student Academic Integrity. Our University was not doing an adequate job dealing with cheating. An embarrassing publicized incident provided a stimulus to do a better job. The result is the Code herein described.

The entire Code is stated for the information of those seeking such details. The "user friendly" settlement procedure is described, and the form with instructions for using this instrument is given. The difficulties of deciding appropriate punishments, and of evaluating mitigating and extenuating circumstances that might bear on guilt or punishment are briefly discussed. The complete faculty authorized statement Deciding Guilt and Punishment is given. Finally, the results of a study on the impact of the Code over several semesters are summarized. At UNC Charlotte we think we have a code of integrity that works where traditional honor codes will not. We think we have a fairly successful and promising solution for problems of student

academic integrity facing large, young, public universities in today's urban population centers.

Background

UNC Charlotte is a young, twenty-five year old, growing urban university serving a diverse student body, more than half of whom commute to campus. The University took shape in a pluralistic and changing society where morality competes with expediency, where unethical behavior is discovered in the highest public offices. This is a society where the notion of personal honor and solid social roles with fixed duties and pride of place have all but disappeared. A young urban institution in this setting, with no solid personal history or tradition, cannot rely on a Code of Honor to insure the academic integrity of students' academic work.

During the early 1980's UNC Charlotte grew to more than 10,000 students. There had been several publicized cases of alleged student cheating which were dealt with in very irregular procedures. The student court system was the only entity with official sanction over cases of student academic dishonesty. In the academic year 1983-84, the student court heard exactly seventeen cases. It was clear that much academic dishonesty was not being dealt with, or was resolved privately and irregularly between instructors and students.

Students complained of not knowing exactly what academic integrity required. The differences, for example, between plagiarism and properly acknowledged paraphrases, or between complicity and appropriate cooperation on group projects were unclear. Faculty members were unsure what to do in the case of dishonesty, and what would be a proper punishment. They were concerned about imposing penalties without due process, a concern particularly strong in a state institution. And there was no way to determine if a suspect was a repeat offender or not. A rumor circulated about several faculty members who, over lunch, discovered they had a student cheater in

common. One version of the story had the culprit a five-time repeater. Whether true or not, the existing honor code and irregular methods of dealing individually and unsystematically with violations could not detect such violations.

To address these problems The UNC Charlotte Code of Student Academic Integrity was written and implemented. This code appeals to individual personal integrity by making the standards and procedures of integrity explicit, clear and fair. It is a code designed to work where reliance on honor alone does not.

Description

The key provisions of the UNC Charlotte Code of Student Academic Integrity include: (1) a statement of the ethical principles and responsibilities that inform the Code, (2) clear definitions of violations illustrated with numerous typical examples, (3) simple procedures under which a faculty member can deal with a suspected case by determining whether the offense would be a first one, and if so having the student admit guilt and accept a penalty by signing a one-page form. The Code also contains a statement on determining a penalty. It indicates that normally the work tainted with dishonesty receives zero credit, and that the course grade is also reduced beyond the effect of that zero. And the Code provides for hearings of particularly serious cases where punishment beyond grade reductions would be appropriate. A student-faculty panel is appointed for such hearings.

A broadly representative faculty task force which included the dean of students, the university attorney, and several key student leaders was commissioned to produce a code of integrity. Numerous existing honor codes and policies for student academic integrity were examined. The University of Maryland's code Academic Dishonesty provided stimulus for much of the form the UNC Charlotte Code finally took. Gary Pavela, director of Judicial Programs and Lecturer in General Honors at Maryland provided expert consultation.

The UNC Charlotte task force first worked out definitions of academic dishonesty, and got broad faculty consensus on the exact nature of actions which violate standards of integrity. Next, campus support was developed for the idea of moving responsibility for student academic integrity out of the student court and the administration of student affairs, into faculty governance and the administration of

academic affairs. Students sometimes are reluctant to "give up" a prerogative or jurisdiction. And some faculty members preferred to have the student court handle cases of dishonesty. These faculty members believed their responsibilities did not include maintaining standards of integrity ("policing" students, as they saw it). The UNC Charlotte task force succeeded in moving responsibility for student academic integrity out of student government into faculty governance and academic affairs by appealing to a key principle that guides the Code. The task force stated that:

> As instructors, faculty members are responsible for transmitting knowledge and the methods by which it is acquired. To do so, they must be able to examine and test student work. The faculty also sets academic standards, awards academic credit and confers degrees when the standards are met. To carry out these responsibilities, faculty members must ensure that student work submitted for academic credit is authentic as well as consistent with established academic standards. Therefore, the academic evaluation includes a judgement that the student's work is free from academic dishonesty of any kind. (Code, Section II)

As the merit of that argument took hold in student and faculty groups, designing a process run by faculty members (involving students by having student court judges involved as members of the Academic Integrity Board) became relatively easy.

The following is the full text of The UNC Charlotte Code of Student Academic Integrity:

THE UNCC CODE
OF
STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Approved by Faculty Council on March 22, 1984
Effective August 16, 1984
Amended August 16, 1987

This Code may be modified from time to time. Users are advised to contact the Office of the Dean of Students to assure they consult the most recent addition.

I. OVERVIEW

The UNCC Code of Student Integrity sets forth the standards of academic integrity for students at UNCC and describes attendant faculty responsibilities. Students and faculty members are expected to be familiar with its provisions. The Code defines student behavior which violates the standards (Section III), and enumerates the penalties for violations and the circumstances under which such penalties may be imposed (Section IV).

Section V sets forth the procedures for dealing with cases where a violation of the Code of Student Academic Integrity is alleged. Those procedures permit a faculty member to address a student's first violation through discussion with the student. If the student freely admits the offense and accepts the penalty assigned by the faculty member, an agreement settling the matter is signed by both, the faculty member imposes the penalty, and the matter ends (Section V.A.). If UNCC records show that the student has previously committed an academic integrity violation, or if the student decides not to admit guilt or accept the penalty, or if the faculty member believes the seriousness of the offense warrants a more severe penalty than those which may be imposed in the settlement process, the matter must be referred to the UNCC Academic Integrity Board (Section V.B.) if any penalty is to be imposed. A student-faculty panel from the Academic Integrity Board hears the evidence from the faculty member and student and determines whether the student did commit a violation. If no violation is found, the matter ends and no penalty may be imposed. If the Hearing Panel finds that the student did commit a violation, it determines the appropriate penalty (Section V.C.). A student found guilty may appeal from the Hearing Panel's determination (Section V.D.).

II. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Academic honesty and integrity are essential to the existence and growth of an academic community. Without maintenance of high standards of honesty, members of the instructional faculty are defrauded, students are unfairly treated, and society itself is poorly served. Maintaining the academic standards of honesty and integrity is ultimately the formal responsibility of the instructional faculty; and this responsibility is shared by all members of the academic community.

As instructors, faculty members are responsible for transmitting knowledge and the methods by which it is acquired. To do so, they must be able to examine and test student work. The faculty also sets academic standards, awards academic credit and confers degrees when the standards are met. To carry out these responsibilities, faculty members must ensure that student work submitted for academic credit is authentic as well as consistent with established academic standards. Therefore, the academic

evaluation includes a judgment that the student's work is free from academic dishonesty of any type; and course grades should be and will be adversely affected by academic dishonesty.

It is a duty of faculty members to take measures to preserve and transmit the values of the academic community, both through example in their own academic pursuits and the learning environment which they create for their students. To this end, they are expected to instill in their students a respect for integrity and a desire to behave honestly; they also must take measures to discourage student academic dishonesty (see Section VI. Advice to Faculty Members). To meet their responsibilities when academic dishonesty is suspected, individual faculty members must follow the policies and procedures stated in this document.

Students are also members of the academic community. As responsible members of The University, students are obligated not to violate the basic standards of integrity, and they are expected to take an active role in encouraging other members to respect those standards. Should a student suspect a violation of academic integrity, he/she should make the suspicion known to a member of the faculty or University administration.

Commitment to maintaining and encouraging high standards of academic honesty and integrity is demonstrated in many ways. One manifestation is the policies and procedures governing violation of the standards. Herein contained are the provisions of the UNCC Code of Student Academic Integrity.

III. DEFINITIONS OF VIOLATIONS

In this section defining student violations of academic integrity: (a) "Intent" refers only to the intent to commit the dishonest action. Other aspects of the student's motive (e.g., a desire to avoid academic suspension, or to help a friend) are not material in determining whether an act of dishonesty has been performed; and (b) "Authorization" is legitimate only if given by the faculty member responsible for the evaluation of the student's work.

A. CHEATING

Intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, notes, study aids or other devices in any academic exercise. This definition includes unauthorized communication of information during an academic exercise.
Typical Examples: Copying from another student's paper or receiving unauthorized assistance during a quiz, test or examination; using books, notes or other devices (e.g., calculators) when these are not authorized; procuring without authorization tests or examinations before the scheduled exercise (including discussion of the substance of examinations and tests when it is expected these will not be discussed); copying reports, laboratory work, computer programs or files and the like from other students; collaborating on laboratory or computer work without authorization and without indication of the nature and extent of the collaboration; sending a substitute to take an examination.

B. FABRICATION AND FALSIFICATION

Intentional and unauthorized alteration or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise. Falsification is a matter of altering information, while fabrication is a matter of inventing or counterfeiting information for use in any academic exercise.
Typical Examples: (Fabrication) inventing or counterfeiting data, research results, information or procedures; inventing data or fabricating research procedures to make it

appear that the results of one process are actually the results of several processes; counterfeiting a record of internship or practicum experiences; (Falsification) altering the record of data or experimental procedures or results; false citation of the source of information (e.g., reproducing a quotation from a book review while indicating that the quotation was obtained from the book itself); altering the record of or reporting false information about practicum or clinical experiences; altering grade reports or other academic records; submitting a false excuse for absence or tardiness in a scheduled academic exercise; altering a returned examination paper and seeking regrading.

C. MULTIPLE SUBMISSION

The submission of substantial portions of the same academic work (including oral reports) for credit more than once without authorization.
Typical Examples: Submitting the same paper for credit in two courses without instructor permission; making minor revisions in a credited paper or report (including oral presentations) and submitting it again as if it were new work. (Different aspects of the same work may receive separate credit; e.g., a report in History may receive credit for its content in a History course and for the quality of presentation in a Speech course.)

D. PLAGIARISM

Intentionally or knowingly presenting the work of another as one's own (i.e., without proper acknowledgment of the source). The sole exception to the requirement of acknowledging sources is when the ideas, information, etc. are common knowledge.
Typical Examples: Submitting as one's own the work of a "ghost writer" or commercial writing service; directly quoting from a source without citation; paraphrasing or summarizing another's work without acknowledging the source; using facts, figures, graphs, charts or information without acknowledgment of the source. Plagiarism may occur orally and in writing. It may involve computer programs and files, research designs, distinctive figures of speech, ideas and images, or generally any "information" which belongs to another.

Plagiarism is the use of the distinctive ideas or words belonging to another person without adequate acknowledgment of that person's contribution. In the context of academic work the standards for acknowledging sources are very high. An author must give due credit whenever quoting another person's actual words, whenever using another person's idea, opinion or theory, and whenever borrowing facts, statistics or illustrative material, unless the information is common knowledge.

1. **Direct Quotation:** Every direct quotation must be identified by quotation marks or by appropriate indentation, and must be promptly acknowledged. The citation must be complete and in a style appropriate to the academic discipline.

EXAMPLE: The following is an example of an unacknowledged direct quotation:

Original Source: "To push the comparison with popular tale and popular romance a bit further, we may note that the measure of artistic triviality of works such as Sir Degare or even Havelok the Dane is their casualness, their indifference to all but the simplest elements of literary substance. The point is that high genre does not certify art and low genre does not preclude it." (From Robert M. Joran, Chaucer and the Shape of Creation, Howard University Press, 1967, p. 187.)

Student Paper: "To push the comparison with popular tale and popular romance a bit further, you can note that the measure of artistic triviality in some works of Chaucer's time period is their casualness, their indifference to all but the simplest elements of literary substance. The point is that high genre does not certify art and low genre does not preclude it."

2. Paraphrase: Prompt acknowledgment is required when material from another source is paraphrased or summarized in whole or in part in one's own words. To acknowledge a paraphrase properly, one might state: "to paraphrase Locke's comment..." or "according to Rousseau..." and conclude with a citation identifying the exact reference.

A citation acknowledging only a directly quoted statement does not suffice to notify the reader of any preceding or succeeding paraphrased material.

Original Source: "The era in question included three formally declared wars. The decision to enter the War of 1812 was made by Congress after extended debate. Madison made no recommendation in favor of hostilities, though he did marshall a 'telling case against England' in his message to Congress of June 1, 1812. The primary impetus to battle, however, seems to have come from a group of 'War Hawks' in the legislature." (From W. Taylor Reveley III, "Presidential War-Making: Constitutional Prerogative or Usurpation?", University of Virginia Law Review, November 1969, footnotes omitted.)

Student Paper: "There were three formally declared wars during this era. The decision to enter the war in 1812 was made by Congress after extended debate. Madison actually made no recommendation in favor of hostilities in his message to Congress of June 1, 1812, though he presented a persuasive case against Britain. The primary impetus to battle, however, appears to have come from a group of 'War Hawks' in the legislature."

3. Borrowed Facts or Information: Information obtained in one's reading or research which is not common knowledge must be acknowledged. Examples of common knowledge might include the names of leaders of prominent nations, basic scientific laws, etc. If there is doubt whether information is common knowledge the citation should be given. Materials which contribute only to one's general understanding of the subject may be acknowledged in the bibliography and need not be immediately cited.

One citation is usually sufficient to acknowledge indebtedness when a number of connected sentences in the paper or report draw their special information from one source. When direct quotations are used, however, quotation marks must be inserted and prompt acknowledgment made. Similarly, when a passage is paraphrased, prompt acknowledgment is required.

E. ABUSE OF ACADEMIC MATERIALS

Intentionally or knowingly destroying, stealing, or making inaccessible library or other academic resource material.

Typical Examples: Stealing or destroying library or reference materials needed for common academic exercises; hiding resource materials so others may not use them; destroying computer programs or files needed in academic work; stealing or intentionally destroying another student's notes or laboratory experiments; receiving assistance in locating or using sources of information in an assignment where such assistance has been forbidden by the instructor. **(NOTE:** The offense of abuse of academic materials shall be dealt with under this Code only when the abuse violates standards of integrity in academic matters, usually in a course or experience for which academic credit is awarded.)

F. COMPLICITY IN ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another to commit an act of academic dishonesty.
Typical Examples: Knowingly allowing another to copy from one's paper during an examination or test; knowingly distributing test questions or substantive information about the material to be tested before the scheduled exercise; collaborating on academic work knowing that the collaboration will not be reported; taking an examination or test for another student, or signing a false name on an academic exercise. **(NOTE:** Collaboration and sharing information are characteristics of academic communities. These become violations when they involve dishonesty. Instructors should make expectations about collaborations clear to students. Students should seek clarification when in doubt.)

IV. PENALTIES

All acts of academic dishonesty violate standards essential to the existence of an academic community. Some first offenses are properly handled and remedied by the faculty member teaching the specific course in which they occur. The faculty member must use the settlement procedure described in Section V to handle such an offense. The penalties which may be assessed are limited to the following:

a. a formal warning,
b. a reduced grade (including F) for the assignment,
c. a reduced grade (including F) for the entire course.

Whatever the penalty, a signed form recording the settlement will be kept for five years in the Office of the Dean of Students. The purpose of this record-keeping is to be sure students who violate the UNCC Code of Student Academic Integrity a second time are dealt with appropriately. A second purpose is to deter students from repeating offenses. The first offense file is an internal record, not part of the student's disciplinary record nor the academic transcript.

In addition to the settlement form on file, there is normally a grade penalty for first violations. Zero credit is assigned to the exercise in which dishonesty occurred. Further, the course grade normally will be reduced beyond the result of that zero. In almost all cases the course grade is reduced to F.

All second offenses and some first offenses have import beyond the specific course in which the violation occurred. The University-wide Academic Integrity Board (AIB) handles such violations, and the range of penalties is greater. The Hearing Panel chosen from the AIB may impose any of the three penalties listed above (a, b, c) and/or the following:

d. Disciplinary suspension from The University for a designated period of time (one semester, one year, two years, etc.). A record of the conviction will be kept in the disciplinary file for a period of time to be determined by the Hearing Panel, after which it will be removed upon written request by the student to the Dean of Students.
e. The grade of F for the course with a designation X on the academic transcript indicating that this is because of dishonesty. If the Hearing Panel imposes this penalty, it will stipulate the exact minimum length of time the X designation shall remain on the academic transcript. When that time has

elapsed, the X designation may be removed from the transcript upon written request by the student to the Director of Enrollment Services. The disciplinary record will record the offense and penalty for a period of time to be determined by the Hearing Panel, after which it will be removed upon written request by the student to the Dean of Students.

f. Expulsion from The University. The academic transcript records the expulsion permanently. A record will be kept in the disciplinary file for five years.

Normally, conviction of a second code violation will result in F for the course with the designation X and a one-year suspension; and normally, a third conviction will result in permanent expulsion.

In all determinations of penalty the following factors should be considered:

a. The nature and seriousness of the offense.
b. The injury or damage resulting from the misconduct.
c. The student's motivation and state of mind at the time of the incident.
d. The student's prior disciplinary record.
e. The student's attitude and demeanor subsequent to the violation.

V. PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING CASES

A faculty member responsible for assigning final grades in a course may acquire evidence either directly or through information supplied by others that a student violation of academic integrity may have occurred. After collecting the evidence available, the faculty member determines whether it warrants proceeding to the next level of inquiry.

If the faculty member determines that the evidence is sufficient, he/she contacts the Dean of Students Office, which will determine from its records whether the student has previously admitted to or been found guilty of an academic integrity violation. If the suspected violation would be a second offense, the faculty member must take the case to the Chairperson of the Academic Integrity Board (AIB). If the suspected violation would constitute a first offense but one for which the faculty member considers the appropriate penalty to be more severe than the F in the course, the case must be brought to the Chairperson of the AIB. If the faculty member believes, however, that the suspected violation would be remedied by a penalty no greater than F in the course, the settlement procedure is used to conclude the matter and provide a record (see Section IV. Penalties).

Once a student has received notice that he/she is charged with an academic integrity offense, the student is not permitted to withdraw from the course unless the procedures for handling such violations result in no grade penalty.

A. Settlement Procedure

The faculty member meets with the student and presents the evidence of an academic integrity violation, then requests an explanation from the student. After hearing the explanation, if the faculty member determines that a violation has occurred, he/she fills out and signs the approved form distributed to all faculty members, noting the penalty to be applied and gives the form to the student. The student has 72 hours to consider and seek advice on whether to admit guilt and accept the penalty by signing that form. If the student agrees to sign, he/she does so in the presence of the faculty member who then implements the penalty. The faculty member forwards the settlement form to

the Dean of Students, who keeps a record of first offenses for five years, and thus the matter is ended. If the student decides not to admit guilt or not to accept the penalty, the faculty member must take the case to the Chairperson of the AIB, if any penalty is to be imposed.

B. Academic Integrity Board

The Academic Integrity Board is made up of all the current Student Court Justices and 12 full-time faculty members appointed from each college, in proportion to the number of faculty members in each. The Chairperson of the AIB is appointed by the Chancellor. The term of appointment of student members is the same as their terms as Student Justices. The faculty members and the Chairperson are appointed for two years. All members of the AIB may be reappointed.

C. Conduct of Hearings

1. **Initiation; Notice of Charge; Panel Selection.** The faculty member refers a case to the AIB by communicating with its Chairperson. The Chairperson selects one student and two faculty members of the AIB as the Hearing Panel for the case. One of the members is designated Convenor of the Hearing Panel to conduct the hearing. Panel members are selected on the basis of availability and impartiality. Neither faculty member may be from the college in which the alleged offense occurred. When the regular faculty members of the AIB or Student Court Justices are unable to serve on a particular case, the Chairperson of the AIB is authorized to appoint a faculty member from an appropriate college, or a student panelist, after consultation with the appropriate Dean. The Chairperson then draws up a written charge stating the facts alleged and notifying the student and the faculty member of the date, time and place for the hearing. The letter shall provide the student and faculty member at least five days after its receipt to prepare for the hearing, and it shall note that the accused student may have access to the case file in the Office of the Dean of Students.

2. **Challenge.** The student or the faculty member may challenge any member selected for the Panel on grounds of a bias or relationship that might affect impartial consideration of the case by that Panel member. The person brings the challenge by discussion with the Chairperson of the AIB at least one day prior to the scheduled hearing. If the Chairperson concludes that the Panel member should be excused, a substitute is selected.

3. **Nature of Hearing.** The hearing is essentially fact-finding in nature. The process is intended to provide participating members of the campus community with a fair, orderly and clearly understood system for inquiry into the facts bearing on a case of alleged dishonesty. The hearing is not an adversarial contest to be "won" or "lost" through clever tactics or merely technical formalities.

4. **Presentation; Burden of Proof; Rights.** The faculty member referring the case presents the evidence of the offense to the Panel. The student is responsible for presenting the evidence he/she wishes, if any, in defense against the charge. The burden of proof is on the faculty member, who must establish the guilt of the student by a preponderance of the evidence. The student and the faculty member have the right to question any witness and inspect any document offered as evidence, and to make whatever statement or argument appears to be appropriate.

5. **Failure to Appear.** If the accused student fails to appear after proper notice, the Panel will reach its conclusion on guilt and appropriate penalty on the basis of the evidence which is presented at the hearing.

6. **Witnesses; Testimony.** The student and faculty member may request the attendance of witnesses at the hearing. University student, faculty or staff witnesses are expected to attend unless compliance would result in significant and unavoidable personal hardship or substantial interference with normal University activities. The student and the faculty member may request the assistance of the Chairperson of the AIB in securing the attendance of witnesses. The Convenor will ask each witness to confirm that the testimony to be given is truthful. Witnesses are expected to attend and give truthful testimony or face appropriate disciplinary action. Affidavits shall not be admitted into evidence unless signed by the affiant and witnessed by a University employee or a person designated by the Chairperson of the AIB.

7. **Attendance; Assistance.** The hearing is closed to the public. The student and the faculty member may each be accompanied by one person (including an attorney), but that person's role is limited to conferring with and advising the student or faculty member; the person is not permitted to argue, make statements, or to question witnesses; the person may respond to questions if asked by Panel members to do so. Members of the student's immediate family (parents or spouse) may also attend the hearing. The Panel may exclude prospective witnesses other than the student during the testimony of any witnesses. An open hearing may be held, in the discretion of the Convenor, if requested by the student.

8. **Evidence.** Formal rules of evidence shall not apply. The Convenor shall give effect to the rules of confidentiality and privilege, but shall otherwise admit all matters into evidence which reasonable persons would accept as having value as proof in the conduct of their affairs. The student's disciplinary record shall not be considered in the hearing on guilt. Repetitious or irrelevant evidence may be excluded by the Convenor.

9. **Control of Proceedings; Disruption.** The Convenor of the Hearing Panel shall exercise control over proceedings to avoid needless consumption of time and to achieve orderly completion of the hearing. Any person, even the accused student, who disrupts a hearing may be excluded by the Convenor.

10. **Recording.** Each hearing shall be tape recorded and the recording shall become a part of the case file in the Office of the Dean of Students.

11. **Deliberation on Guilt.** The decision on guilt shall be made in private and shall be by majority vote, based on the evidence presented at the hearing.

12. **Not Guilty Found.** If the conclusion is that the student is not guilty, the participants are readmitted, the Convenor announces that conclusion, and terminates the proceeding. Thereafter, a written report is prepared, signed by the Convenor, and sent to the Dean of Students. The Dean maintains only a single confidential file of material related to the case. No part of that file becomes part of the student's disciplinary record. The case is closed, and no penalty may be imposed.

13. **Hearing on Penalty.** If the conclusion is that the student is guilty, the hearing continues to determine the appropriate penalty. The Hearing Panel considers the factors listed in Section IV. Penalties. Both student and faculty member may submit evidence and make statements concerning the appropriate sanction to be imposed. The Dean of Students will supply the student's disciplinary record for this supplementary proceeding.

14. **Imposition of Penalty.** At the conclusion of the evidence on the appropriate penalty, the Hearing Panel deliberates in private. Upon making its determination of the penalty, the participants are readmitted. The student is expected to be present, and the faculty member may be present if he/she wishes. The Convenor announces the penalty determined. The date of this announcement is the Hearing Conclusion Date. The Hearing Panel thereafter prepares a written report, signed by the Convenor, stating its findings, the determination on guilt and the penalty it deems appropriate. The Convenor sends the report to the student and a copy of the report to the Dean of Students, who notifies the faculty member of its contents. If a penalty of a grade of F in the course or less is to be assigned, the faculty member imposes that penalty determined by the Hearing Panel and no other penalty. If a greater penalty is deemed appropriate, the Dean of Students implements the penalty indicated in the report.

15. **Right of Appeal; Effect.** A student found guilty is permitted three days from the Hearing Conclusion Date to file a written notice of appeal with the Dean of Students Office (see Section V.D. Appeals). In the discretion of the Dean of Students the imposition of sanction normally is deferred until the three days have elapsed without notice of appeal received or until the appeal proceedings are concluded.

16. **Notice of Imposition of Penalty.** If notice of appeal is not filed within the three days or if the appeal results in no change in the Hearing Panel's decision, the Dean of Students notifies the student by letter of the penalty being imposed. The letter shall inform the student of all records to be kept of the incident and of any opportunity to expunge the records.

D. **Appeals**

1. As a member of the institution whose Hearing Panel has made a determination on guilt and/or appropriate penalty, the faculty member is bound by the Panel's determinations and is not permitted an appeal. If a grievance has arisen, the faculty member may take it to the appropriate grievance body.

2. The student must submit any notice of appeal from a Hearing Panel's determination of guilt or penalty to the Dean of Students within three days after the Hearing Conclusion Date. Failure to do so will render the decision of the Hearing Panel final and conclusive.

3. The student must submit a written brief in support of the appeal to the Dean of Students within ten days after the Hearing Conclusion Date. Failure to submit a written brief within the time allotted will render the decision of the Hearing Panel final and conclusive.

4. If the request for appeal and written brief have been timely filed, the Dean of Students shall deliver them with the record on appeal to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

5. The appeal shall be decided upon the record of the original proceeding, case file, request for appeal, and written brief submitted by the student. No new evidence will be taken.

6. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or his/her designate shall review the record and issue a written decision on the appeal. If the Vice Chancellor designates another, that person's review and decision shall be treated in all respects as if made by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The decision may:

   a. Affirm the findings and sanction imposed by the Hearing Panel.
   b. Affirm the findings and reduce but not eliminate the penalty determined by the Hearing Panel, but only if that penalty is found grossly inappropriate to the offense.
   c. Remand the case to the Hearing Panel, but only if specified procedural errors were so substantial as effectively to deny the student a fair hearing, or if new and significant evidence became available which could not have been discovered by a properly diligent student before or during the original hearing. The decision of the Hearing Panel on remand shall be final and conclusive, except that the student may appeal the Panel's decision on remand to the Chancellor. Such appeal is permitted only by the method and on the grounds specified in paragraph eight below.

7. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or his/her designate shall send copies of the decision on the appeal to the student, faculty member, Dean of Students, and Chairperson of the Academic Integrity Board.

8. The decision of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or his/her designate shall be final and conclusive, except that if the student alleges violation of the right of due process and fair hearing, the presumption of innocence until found guilty, the right to know the evidence and to face witnesses testifying against him or her, or the right to such advice and assistance in his/her own defense as may be allowable under the regulations of UNCC as approved by the Chancellor, the student may file a written signed letter of appeal with the Chancellor. Such written appeal must be received by the Chancellor within four days after the student receives notice of the Vice Chancellor's decision and shall set forth with particularity the specific right or rights allegedly denied and the facts or circumstances alleged to establish the denial of such right or rights.

VI. ADVICE TO FACULTY MEMBERS

The following are some of the measures appropriate to preventing and discouraging violations of this code:

1. Faculty members should outline their expectations pertaining to academic integrity at the beginning of each course. In doing so they might authorize or prohibit specific forms of student conduct which are unique to their courses or disciplines. They should refer students to this UNCC Code of Student Academic Integrity.

2. Faculty members are advised that files of past examinations are maintained by some organizations and are readily available to large numbers of students. If faculty members wish to put any restrictions on the use of examinations they return to students, this should be made clear.

3. Academic departments should keep examinations in a secure location and should carefully screen employees who may have access to such material. All waste copies of examinations should be destroyed along with stencil masters and ditto backing sheets. Student employees should not be asked to prepare or handle examinations.

4. Examinations should be carefully proctored by trusted employees. More than one proctor should be present when large numbers of students take an examination. Other preventive measures include a pre-arranged seating plan or a sign-in sheet (by seat numbers), so the location of each student may be determined. If it is not possible to allow sufficient space between seats, consideration should be given to using several different sets of questions, or permutating question numbers. In large classes, instructors should consider collecting an examination signature card from each student at the beginning of the semester. At examination time, another signature card, distributed with the examination, could be collected and compared with the original.

5. Methods for preventing and detecting plagiarism include (a) assigning specific topics for each student, (b) use of in-class discussions to choose topics and (c) use of frequent in-class writing exercises, thereby making anomalous submissions easier to identify. Also, copies of the various commercial term paper catalogs, which list the specific titles and topics currently available to students, might be kept on file.

Results

Implementation of our integrity code under the care of the faculty, a code with simple, clear and fair procedures, has had one immediate and notable result. The number of convictions for academic dishonesty increased from 17 in the previous academic year to 29 in the first semester of implementation (more than a threefold increase). Since Fall 1984 there have been 251 cases handled, 208 of them directly between the faculty member and the student, and 43 of them in a hearing of the Academic Integrity Board.

A case goes to the Academic Integrity Board (AIB) for one of three reasons: (a) it would constitute a second offense, (b) it is a particularly serious offense not properly settled with a grade penalty in the course, or (c) the student will not admit guilt or accept the penalty assigned by the instructor. Of the 43 cases heard by the AIB, ten (10) of them or 23% resulted in a "not guilty" verdict. This suggests that when students are mistakenly charged, they can take the matter to the AIB and receive a fair hearing. The AIB is also capable of imposing very serious penalties. Since implementation, there have been six suspensions and one expulsion. Approximately eleven cases resulted in a mark on the permanent transcript (which may be removed at the request of the student after a fixed period of time, usually several years).

Of the 43 cases brought to the AIB, sixteen (16) of them or 37% were involved with repeat offenses. But only nine (9) individual students accounted for those 16 repeats (one was a three-time offender who was expelled). Therefore, a total of 36 students had cases before the AIB. There were nine (9) students or 25% there because of repeat offenses, and twenty-seven (27) were there for other reasons.

The vast majority of violations are settled directly betwen the student and the instructor. This fair, clear, effective and "user friendly" method is a key to the success of the UNC Charlotte Code. The following is the form with instructions used in dealing directly with a case of dishonesty. It indicates exactly how this key part of the Code operates.

SETTLEMENT OF A CHARGE OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Notice to Student:

1. You are not required to sign this form.
2. If you do not sign this form, you have a right to a hearing before a neutral student-faculty panel before any disciplinary penalty may be imposed for the offense charged.
3. You have 72 hours to seek advice and decide whether to sign. You may discuss your decision with any person you choose, including student advisors participating in the Student Judicial System (contact the Dean of Students Office, 547-2375).
4. If you sign, you are admitting guilt and accepting the penalty shown.
5. If you sign, this form is kept on record for five (5) years and may be used against you if you commit another disciplinary offense. This settlement form is not disclosed to prospective employers or to other schools to which you may apply.

• • • •

"Settlement of a Charge of Academic Dishonesty" Form

Instructions for Using

These instructions are to be used in conjunction with the UNCC Code of Student Academic Integrity; they are not a substitute for the Code and should not be used as such.

When a professor acquires evidence that a student has been dishonest in his/her course, he/she must first contact the Dean of Students Office (2375), where records of first violations are kept, to determine whether this is a first violation for this particular student.

1. If this is NOT a first violation for this student, the professor MUST report this case to the Chairperson of the Academic Integrity Board (AIB), if any penalty is to be imposed. Second and subsequent offenses may NOT be handled with the Settlement Form.

2. If this IS a first violation for this student, then the professor must decide whether to handle the case with the Settlement Form or take it to the AIB. In making this decision, the professor must remember that the greatest penalty that can be given the student through the Settlement Form is an "F" in the course. If that penalty is insufficient for the infraction, then the case must go to the AIB.

IF THE SETTLEMENT FORM IS TO BE USED, the professor must:

1. Meet with the student and present the evidence.

2. Request an explanation from the student. Remember that the student has a right to offer an explanation after being told of the evidence.

3. After hearing any explanation, determine whether a violation has occurred.

4. If the determination is positive, complete and sign the "Instructor" section of the Settlement Form. Provide enough information so that it is clear when, where, and how the violation occurred. Use an additional sheet of paper if necessary. Be certain to initial additional pages.

5. Give the Settlement Form to the student. Tell the student that he/she has seventy-two (72) hours to decide whether to admit guilt and accept the penalty. Encourage the student to consider the matter carefully and to seek any assistance or advice needed to make an informed, deliberate decision.

IF THE STUDENT DECIDES TO ACCEPT THE PENALTY during the seventy-two hour period, he/she must sign the form in the professor's presence. The professor then forwards the form to the Dean of Students and imposes the penalty agreed upon. The Dean of Students will keep the form on record for five years.

IF THE STUDENT REFUSES TO SIGN THE SETTLEMENT FORM, then the professor may:

1. Take the case to the AIB by calling the Chairperson of the Board.

2. Drop the entire matter. This should only be done if the evidence is insufficient to warrant a conviction before the AIB. When there is doubt, consult with the AIB Chairperson.

1/90

We hope that the efficient, fair and "user friendly" settlement process encourages and facilitates faculty members in maintaining standards of academic integrity. And we hope that there is a significant deterrent when first offenders realize that the settlement form is kept on file for five years, entailing that another violation automatically goes to the AIB. As mentioned above, 9 of the 36 students with cases sent to the AIB were accused of repeat offenses. We believe the "first offenders" file has some deterrent effect.

Since 1984, cheating was the most frequent violation with 134 cases or 53% of the 251 cases total. Plagiarism was next in frequency, with 89 cases or 35% of all. There were just four cases of fabrication since 1984, three cases of multiple submission, and three cases of complicity until Spring 1989 when a group of 16 students were convicted of complicity in stealing and distributing an examination.

After several semesters under the Code, a study was done to detect problems and suggest changes to improve the document. One very positive response came from faculty members who had actually "used" the Code in confronting cases of dishonesty. All of them felt that the Code provided clear guidance and helped them reach a conclusion in

which they have a high degree of confidence. As a junior faculty member put it recently, "The Code made me feel I was not alone when dealing with the dishonest student, that the whole faculty and university were behind me in the matter."

The study also indicated that faculty members and students felt unsure of the punishments to expect in cases of dishonesty. There was some sentiment in favor of uniform penalties. But data suggested that removing faculty discretion on assigning punishments would cause them to exercise discretion in deciding guilt, that faculty members would tend to acquit a guilty student rather than convict the student of a violation with a mandatory punishment attached. The task force to study the Code came up with a statement of principles to use in assigning penalties. The core idea is that work tainted with academic dishonesty receives zero credit, and that the course grade should be substantially reduced further, beyond the result of that zero. The main intent is to treat work tainted with dishonesty differently from missed assignments or other failing work submitted by honest students. Articulating that principle has resulted in an increased sense of confidence in some faculty members that their punishments are reasonable and right.

The study of the Code also disclosed a fair amount of confusion regarding excusing and mitigating circumstances. Is sincere ignorance of the Code an excuse? If a student sincerely did not intend to defraud the instructor, but intended only to help a friend during an exam, is there a Code violation? The study task force attempted to resolve such questions in a statement submitted to the faculty for endorsement: The document UNCC Student Academic Integrity: On Deciding Guilt and Punishment, is printed below. In it the notion of "intent" is discussed in terms of intending the action, not in terms

of intending fraud. The criterion of "knowingly" doing the action is defined in terms of the act, not in terms of the Code. Ignorance of the Code is culpable. And in the discussion of penalties, the document reminds faculty members that even if no grade penalty is assigned, the student's admission of guilt recorded in the Dean of Student's Office is a genuine deterrent form of punishment. As reported above, apparently the deterrent works. The point is that faculty members who are more concerned with deterrence than retribution can prosecute students under the Code while adhering to their own principles.

UNCC STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: ON DECIDING GUILT AND PUNISHMENT

by R. H. Toenjes
Approved by Faculty Council
April 16, 1987

This discussion is based on information from a study of The UNCC Code of Student Academic Integrity conducted during 1986. It seeks to articulate several kinds of ideas about which consensus exists in dealing with academic dishonesty at UNCC. The goal is to assist faculty members faced with student dishonesty to reach conclusions which are consistent with the code and common practice across campus.

The first section addresses the matter of how to decide that a student has violated the code. Often this is not a problem. But sometimes it is not clear what the student must intend or know in order to violate the code. In some cases, circumstances that would properly be taken as mitigating factors for determining the penalty, are mistaken as proof of innocence.

The second section explains how to decide penalties for code violations. It states the normal penalty, and it makes explicit the reasoning behind the consensus on the normal penalty.

Throughout the reader should bear in mind that the information, analyses and explanations are offered solely for reflection and clarification. They are in no way binding, and do not define University policy in any way beyond the code (which is policy). The normal penalty appears in the code.

A. DECIDING GUILT

1. Intent: Students probably never intend to violate the code. What they intend is to receive a higher grade, to prevent loss of scholarship, athletic or other eligibility, to get a good grade, to avoid consequences of lack of preparation due to a variety of causes.

   Furthermore, many students probably do not explicitly form the intention to deceive or defraud the instructor or to engage in dishonesty. Probably what happens is the student intends to copy from another during an exam, or intends to copy from a source without citation. And the student intends to submit the work for credit. But the student never explicitly formulates the intention to deceive or defraud the instructor or to engage in dishonesty. The student just doesn't think of this. The student does not reflect on the fact that when there is unauthorized or unacknowledged copying and then the work is submitted for credit, this necessarily involves dishonesty.

   The only intent involved in violating the code is the intent to perform the action itself: e.g., intentionally bringing a crib sheet to an examination, purposely altering or counterfeiting information, intentionally submitting the same work twice, intentionally claiming as one's own the work of another, intentionally destroying resource material, or intentionally helping another to do such actions.

2. Knowledge: The student violator must know that he/she is doing the action. It is not necessary that the student knows the action violates the code. The code is University policy, and students are responsible for being familiar with it. It has been in force since 1984 and is widely publicized. The Catalog itself states clearly student responsibility in this regard.

3. Authorization: The matter of authorization figures into determinations that cheating, fabrication and multiple submissions are code violations. Even regarding plagiarism and proper acknowledgment of sources the authorization issue sometimes plays an essential role, because proper acknowledgment relates to rules and expectations within courses and disciplines. And complicity sometimes involves authorization in situations where students collaborate on projects, help one another with course work, receive tutorial assistance, etc.

   Knowledge that authorization has been given, raises an important issue. Students, like all of us, can have erroneous beliefs. A student might erroneously believe that authorization has been given when this is not the case. Erroneous belief, when the mistake is sincere and not culpable, does not constitute dishonesty and hence cannot constitute code violation. An honest yet mistaken belief that the instructor authorized use of books, calculators, etc. in an exam is not cheating.

   Erroneous belief that something is not prohibited when in fact it is raises other issues. First, the code prohibits many things; but even sincere ignorance of the code is no excuse, because it is culpable ignorance. Second, a student could sincerely and reasonably believe that something has not been explicitly prohibited by an instructor when in fact it has. For example, it may be that on previous course exercises open books, use of calculators, collaboration, resubmission of previously graded work, etc. were authorized, but on a given exercise these were explicitly prohibited. A student may not have heard or read the explicit new prohibition and have an honest yet erroneous belief that the materials in question are still authorized. In such a case the student might be guilty of academic failure (to follow directions or instructions) but not of academic dishonesty. Third, it may be that no explicit authorization or prohibition has been made. This is the case for all of the commonly shared understandings that surround all explicit rules. For example, while seldom explicitly authorized, students are expected to use pencils in exams, to consult notes and books and even fellow students in preparing for exercises, and so forth. And students are expected to know where to draw the line between, for example, paraphrasing which must be cited, and using without citation an idea or expression obtained in study, reading, conversation, etc. Similarly, students are expected to know the boundary between prohibited and admissible use of previously credited work (the code prohibits only resubmission of substantial portions).

   In this category of common background understandings which are assumed but not explicitly stated, the following should guide determinations of code violations: The student is required to get clarification when in doubt. Of course the instructor should provide clarification, even occasionally anticipate situations that might raise doubt. If the student had doubt about authorization or prohibition, but did not get clarification, the student will be presumed to have known the material was not authorized. The burden here is on the student who has a doubt to get clarification. If the student had no such doubt

the burden shifts. Now it has to be shown that a reasonable person in these circumstances would have had the doubt, and hence the student in question should have had the doubt and sought clarification. The burden is on the accusing faculty member or the AIB panel to establish or determine this.

4. Multiple Submission: The same standards of intent, knowledge and authorization apply here. The student must know that substantial portions of the same work are submitted for credit more than once, and that the instructor has not authorized it. For students, where quantities of academic credit and work determine in part completion of the program, repeat usage of the same material must be authorized by the course instructor. Whatever students may believe about their rights to use their own work, they are bound by the code.

5. Plagiarism: The student must intend that the work presented be taken as his/her own, and must know that the work is not his/her own. The student need not know whose the work is, only that he or she is not the author. Thus, turning in as my work a paper I found in the trash is plagiarism. And this is why use of common knowledge is not plagiarism. If the knowledge is common, it is all of ours (i.e., members of the community in question) and hence all are entitled to its use.

6. Complicity: Here the student would have to know that he/she is helping another to commit an act of dishonesty. If all the student knows is that he/she is helping another, and is genuinely not aware that the other will use the help to do something which violates the code, there is no complicity.

B. DECIDING PENALTY

1. Settlement Form: Having decided that the student knowingly and intentionally performed the action which violates the code, the next decision is what penalty to assign. One thing to keep in mind is that the signed Settlement Form which is kept on file for five years in the Dean of Students Office is itself important. While it does no immediate or direct harm to the student, it guarantees that any further violation will be heard by the AIB and the board's decision on penalty will take into account the fact that the student is a repeat offender. Thus even a formal warning with no further penalty is a genuine and strong deterrent.

2. The Normal Penalty: Having decided guilt and that at least a formal warning will be given, the next determination is whether the circumstances of the case constitute aggravating or mitigating factors. But the first thing to note is that a determination that the violation merits a more or a less severe punishment requires some kind of norm or base from which to make adjustments. To decide on a heavier or a lighter punishment one needs some kind of idea of NORMAL PENALTY.

The consensus of the UNCC faculty is that the normal penalty for academic dishonesty is (a) zero credit on the work tainted by dishonesty, (b) further substantial reduction of the course grade beyond the grade that would result from that zero, and (c) in almost all cases the course grade is reduced to "F".

The reason to assign zero credit on the tainted work is simply that such work does not count toward a grade at all; it is entirely null and void for credit because of the dishonesty. The reasons to further reduce the course grade include: (1) Simply limiting the grade impact to the zero on the tainted work treats dishonest students the same as honest ones. Honest students miss assignments and fail tests too. The consequence of submitting tainted work must be different from the result of submitting no work or failing work. (2) Often dishonest students were already in jeopardy of failing the exercise, and possible loss of credit on the assignment is no risk all all. (3) Students who violate the integrity code must experience immediate negative consequences, and this must be understood by all students. Since the tainted work is already disqualified, the negative impact on the course grade must extend beyond the result of that zero. To be experienced as punishment at all, the student must see the course grade reduced substantially beyond the result of the zero.

The reasons to reduce the course grade to "F" include: (1) This penalty is one which truly accomplishes the negative consequences on the student that a penalty should accomplish. (2) When students and faculty members come to understand that "F" in the course is the normal or presumed penalty, a degree of clarity and uniformity in penalties will be clearly achieved. (3) This clarity and uniformity, together with the severity of being punished with "F" in the course, will have a significant deterrent effect on all students.

In some circumstances faculty members using the settlement procedure might decide that "F" in the course is not warranted. In such cases, the faculty member should carefully consider at least some reduction in the course grade, beyond the impact of the zero on the tainted assignment. For again, merely to assign zero on the tainted work is actually no punishment, and it treats the dishonest student no differently than an honest student who did not complete the assignment or failed to pass it despite an honest attempt.

3. Identifying the work tainted by dishonesty: While there is no question about how to assign zero to tainted work, there may be a question regarding what or how much work is actually tainted by dishonesty. Clearly, an entire paper resubmitted for credit more than once is entirely tainted. So too is a plagiarized paper in which all the substantive content has been copied or paraphrased. Preparing and using a crib sheet in an examination taints the entire exercise with dishonesty.

But occasionally it appears that only a discrete portion of an exercise involves dishonesty. Sometimes students change several answers on exams that have been graded and returned, seeking additional credit. Sometimes they plagiarize a chart or diagram in a report that is otherwise authentically their own. Or the plagiarism may apparently exist only in part of an otherwise authentic paper. Consensus at UNCC is that any dishonesty in an academic exercise taints the entire exercise. Accordingly, it is proper to assign zero credit to the entire exercise even if a portion of it is authentic. In such cases, it may be appropriate to assign a less severe punishment; but it is not appropriate to give any credit for the work tainted with dishonesty.

To summarize, the normal penalty for academic dishonesty at UNCC is decided as follows:

a. Assign zero credit to the exercise tainted by dishonesty.

b. Reduce the course grade substantially beyond the grade that would result with that zero factored in. In almost all cases the course grade should be reduced to "F".

c. If "F" on the course is not warranted, at least some reduction in the course grade should be made, beyond the result of the zero on the tainted work.

4. Factors to Consider: With the norm in mind, and the reasoning that leads to it made explicit, one now turns to the actual case and identifies factors relevant to the determination of penalty. Section IV of the code indicates that the following should be considered:

a. The nature and seriousness of the offense.
b. The injury or damage resulting from the misconduct.
c. The student's motivation and state of mind at the time of the incident.
d. The student's prior disciplinary record.
e. The student's attitude and demeanor subsequent to the violation.

In some cases the faculty member may be convinced that only a discrete portion of the exercise involved dishonesty. Here the nature and seriousness of the offense, or the injury resulting may be judged mitigating factors. If so, the zero on the exercise with no further grade penalty or only a one letter reduction in the course grade may be appropriate.

Faculty members should also keep in mind that some first violations of the code are so serious that merely to assign "F" in the course, which is the maximum penalty a faculty member may impose, is insufficient (e.g., students have stolen examinations and distributed them to others for pay). Sometimes a student is doing so poorly in the course that receiving zero on an exam and a "F" in the course is absolutely no punishment. In cases where "F" in the course is not sufficient, the faculty member should take the case to the Academic Integrity Board which is empowered to assign more severe punishments, including suspension and expulsion. The faculty member initiates such action simply by contacting the Chairperson of the AIB.

Finally, students typically appeal to their motivation as a reason to be judged innocent of a code violation. Faculty members should recall the discussion in the first section of this document: motive only involves the intent to do the action, nothing more. However, it may be that motive is a mitigating factor suggesting a lighter punishment. Such was the case of a student living at home whose father forged a note from a medical doctor and insisted it be submitted as an excuse for missing a quiz. But motive would not be a mitigating factor, in fact, it would probably be an aggravating factor, if a student-athlete under pressure to maintain academic eligibility were to cheat on a quiz.

Faculty members are encouraged to impose the normal penalty in every case of code violation, and to be quite hesitant to reduce below that norm. Most students believe that most academic dishonesty is not detected or punished. For UNCC to make a clear and strong statement that academic integrity is a most important matter, firm and appropriate punishment must result from violations of code.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Since implementation five years ago, the Code of Student Academic Integrity has improved the climate for integrity on campus. Cheaters are more likely to get caught, of course. And faculty members more frequently use the officially sanctioned procedures. Thus, the likelihood of repeat offenders going undetected is lessened. Perhaps more importantly, students see The UNC Charlotte Code of Academic Integrity regularly indicated on course syllabi, and they see a summary of the Code printed on the covers of their examination "blue books." Each semester a summary report on cases of academic dishonesty is published in the student newspaper and in the campus faculty-staff newsletter.

Nonetheless, much more can be done and will be done to keep the virtues of integrity before the mind of the campus. Students still tend to believe that lots of cheating goes on, and that little gets caught. Faculty members still believe that they successfuly detect most of the cheating. Something has to give here. And too many students fail to understand fully enough, and to accept as their own, the principles and moral underpinnings of the Code of Academic Integrity. We have on the drawing board two kinds of projects that will get at these problems.

1. A course module on the Integrity Code can be prepared. Several faculty members actually use the Code as course material in their "Critical Thinking" courses. The idea is to show a model of moral and legal reasoning in an important context of relevance to the students. This module always edifies the students. They come away with an understanding of integrity in general, along with a sense of pride in belonging to UNC Charlotte which has this Integrity Code. The first project is to refine and redesign this kind of course module for

possible insertion into the Freshman Composition course. If appropriate as an academic exercise, it would certainly publicize to virtually all students the nature of the commitment to integrity codified at UNC Charlotte.

2. A multi-media presentation, for use in Freshman Composition classes and in summer orientation can be prepared. In it, violations of the code can be enacted, and discussion from "person on the street" or students on campus can also be shown. The idea here is to create a stimulus, a discussion-starter appropriate for use in composition classes as well as other programs or orientation experiences.

We believe, and we think the reader also believes, that students and faculty members want to do the right thing. As regards academic integrity, a clear and fair system, with its foundational principles explicit, motivates and inspires acceptance and compliance. And as faculty members recognize their professional responsibility for academic standards, including integrity, the "user friendly" settlement process facilitates meeting those responsibilities. Recently our sister institution, Appalachian State University, adopted a code modeled very closely on the UNC Charlotte Code. The ASU Code is beginning to work there as our Code is working at Charlotte. Maintaining awareness of the Code, keeping academic integrity on the minds of students and faculty members remains the continuing challenge. But ours is an Integrity Code that works where a traditional honor code will not.